REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed January 5, 2004, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration.

IN THE WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF THE SPECIFICATION

In response to the objections to the title (Office Action, Section 1), Applicant has replaced the title with a new title as shown above. No new matter has been added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to approve the new title.

IN THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-13 were previously pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant amends claims 1 and 9. Claims 1-13 are pending for examination, of which claims 1 and 9 are independent. No new matter has been added.

1. Claims 1-8 Patentably Distinguish Over Pettus

Claims 1-8 stand rejected (Office Action, Section 3) under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as purportedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,360,266 (Pettus). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

1.1 Discussion of Pettus

Preliminarily, Applicant notes that Pettus is wholly unrelated to debugging a target system using a host system connected thereto. Rather Pettus is directed to distributed computer networks and more specifically to distributed network directory and naming services (col. 1, lines 22-24). Consequently, it has proven difficult to understand the Office Action's basis for rejecting claim 1 under §102(e) based on Pettus. Nonetheless, to further the prosecution of this application, Applicant has made a good faith effort to understand and respond to the §102(e) rejection. If, however, the Examiner has an understanding of the reference that differs from Applicant's understanding, and the Examiner continues to believe that the claims are not patentable over Pettus, the Examiner is respectfully requested to issue a new, non-final Office Action that clearly articulates any rejection based on Pettus in accordance with MPEP §706.

Pettus illustrates a communications directory service (CDS) located on each node of a network. The CDS on each node includes a tree structure to which existing directory services and other network services can be added (col. 4, lines 18-23). Each node may use a

reconfigurable protocol stack to establish network connections to remove nodes. The CDS stores a set of stack definitions which enables the node to set up the reconfigurable stack for a particular communication link. Each network service has a corresponding service object that contains references to one or more stack definitions for communication links appropriate to that service. When a client retrieves a service object to implement a service, one of the stack definitions is selected based on criteria such as quality of service or availability of the link (col. 4, lines 36-46).

Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action (Section 3, page 2), Pettus does not teach a method of debugging a target system using a host system connected thereto. The Office Action asserts that such method is disclosed on col. 8, lines 28-37. However, this cited text merely describes that the system of Pettus can be applied to the concept of "application frameworks," and provides a list of examples for which these frameworks can be used, for example, text and user interfaces, printing, graphics, multimedia, file systems, I/O, testing, etc. Nowhere in Pettus does it teach that "application frameworks" has anything to do with debugging a target system using a host system. Rather, Pettus discloses that "application frameworks" are predefined classes and libraries that define a set of objects and additional miscellaneous routines that are all directed to performing commonly-encountered tasks in a particular environment (col. 7, lines 27-35).

Contrary to the assertions of the Office Action, Pettus does not teach that a target system has a reserved storage location designated as a vector. The Office Action contends that this disclosure is found on col. 4, lines 38-44. However, this cited text merely describes a generic hardware configuration, not a reserved storage location designated as a vector. Further, Pettus does not teach storing a plurality of application programs, each application program having respective associated *exception handler code* (emphasis added), as contended by the Office Action. The text cited by the Office Action (col. 4, lines 38-44; col. 11, lines 5-11) does not disclose exception handler code at all. Rather, the cited text discloses the use of reconfigurable protocol stacks on nodes of a network to establish network connections to remote nodes.

Pettus does not disclose causing a vector of a target system to point to a stack whereby all applications use the stack for a particular exception, as contended by the Office Action. In contrast, the text cited by the Office Action (col. 4, lines 42-44; col. 11, lines 5-11), describes service objects that contain references to one or more stack definitions for communication links appropriate to a particular service. A client can then use the service object to open a

communication path. This cited text, and, in fact, the entire Pettus reference, is silent with regard to the use of exceptions.

1.2 Claim 1 is Not Anticipated By Pettus

Claim 1 has been amended solely for clarification, and not in response to the §102 rejection or any art of record. Claim 1 as amended recites:

> A method of debugging a target system using a host system connected thereto, the target system comprising a digital signal processor having associated memory comprising plural addressable locations, said target system further having a reserved storage location designated as a vector, said memory further storing a plurality of application programs, each application program having respective associated exception handler code, the method comprising:
>
> dynamically loading a stack to a reserved region of said memory; and
>
> causing the vector of said target system to point to said stack, whereby all said application programs use the said stack for a particular exception.

Claim 1 is not anticipated by Pettus because Pettus fails to teach or suggest a method of debugging a target system using a host system, the method comprising, *inter alia*, causing a vector of a target system to point to a stack, whereby all application programs use the stack for a particular exception. In fact, Pettus is silent regarding debugging or the use of exceptions.

In view of the foregoing, claim 1 is not anticipated by Pettus. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under §102(e) as being anticipated by Pettus be withdrawn. Claims 2-8 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejections of these claims be withdrawn.

2. Claims 9-13 Patentably Distinguish over Pettus

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Pettus. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 9 patentably distinguishes over Pettus because Pettus does not disclose or suggest a **device for debugging a target system**, the device comprising a host system connected thereto, the target system comprising a digital signal processor having associated memory comprising a plurality of addressable locations, said target system further having a reserved storage location designated as a vector, said memory further storing plural application programs, each application program having respective associated exception handler code, the device further comprising: a

stack dynamic loading circuitry in said host for dynamically loading a stack to a reserved region of said memory, whereby said loading circuitry comprises an indication of the location in said memory of said stack; and a vector writing circuitry receiving said indication, and writing to said vector of said target system the address of said stack, **whereby all said application programs use the said stack for a particular exception**, as recited in claim 9.

In view of the foregoing, claim 9 patentably distinguishes over Pettus. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests the rejection of claim 9 under §102(e) as being anticipated by Pettus be withdrawn. Claims 10-13 depend from claim 9 and are patentable for the same reasons. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 10 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application should now be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 23/2825.

Respectfully submitted,
Mark Phillips, Applicant

By: _____

Daniel P. McLoughlin, Reg. No. 46,066
Wolf, Greenfield & Sacks, P.C.
600 Atlantic Avenue
Boston, Massachusetts 02210-2211
Tel. No.: (617) 720-3500
Attorney for Applicant

Docket No.: S1022.80618US00
Date: April 26, 2004